



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

fact, a gift *mortis causa* has been held valid although the donor died of another disease than the one he feared. *Ridden v. Thrall*, 125 N. Y. 572, 26 N. E. 627. It would seem therefore that the gift should have been sustained in the principal case. Consumptives are proverbially optimistic, and the fact that a man takes steps to cure a serious disease does not mean he has no realization of his danger.

**HABEAS CORPUS** — JURISDICTION TO ISSUE WRIT AFTER COMMITMENT BY ANOTHER FEDERAL COURT UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE ALLEGED TO BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL. — A witness called by a committee of the House of Representatives, authorized to investigate financial conditions as a preliminary to legislation and to examine witnesses for that purpose, refused to answer certain questions put to him by the committee. He was thereupon indicted in the District of Columbia for contempt under U. S. REV. STAT., §§ 101-104, arrested in New York, and held for removal. He then applied for a writ of *habeas corpus* on the ground that Congress had no power under the Constitution to compel a citizen to give such testimony. *Held*, that the writ be discharged. *Henry v. Henkel*, 235 U. S. 219.

*Habeas corpus* proceedings present the issue whether the prisoner is unlawfully restrained of his liberty. U. S. REV. STAT., § 752. But the general rule is that on such applications, the federal courts will not determine controverted questions of law or fact, but will leave the prisoner to prove his right to liberty in the trial court, and if unsuccessful there, to prosecute his claim by writ of error. See *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U. S. 241, 251. In certain exceptional cases, as where the issuance of the writ is necessary to protect the federal government in the execution of its functions, the court will inquire fully into the questions of law and fact involved, and make a summary order. *In re Neagle*, 135 U. S. 1. And in any case, an immediate writ would issue if it appeared that there was no provision of the common law or of any statute making the act charged an offense. See *Greene v. Henkel*, 183 U. S. 249, 261. But where, as in the principal case, an indictment makes a *prima facie* case, the court will confine itself to a determination of the other tribunal's authority over such a case as this appears to be on its face, and will not inquire into the constitutionality of the statute supporting the indictment, or the sufficiency of the charge. *Matter of Gregory*, 219 U. S. 210. The application of this general rule to the principal case made it unnecessary for the court to pass upon the interesting and long-mooted question of the power of Congress to compel witnesses to give testimony to be used as a basis for legislation.

**INTERSTATE COMMERCE** — CONTROL BY STATES — RIGHT OF FOREIGN CORPORATION TO ENFORCE IN STATE COURTS CONTRACTS ARISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE. — A foreign corporation sued in a state court to recover the price of goods shipped to a resident of the state in compliance with an order given to its traveling salesman. A state statute which denied the right to sue in the state courts to any foreign corporation which had not appointed a resident agent and filed certain reports, was construed by the state court to apply to this transaction. *Held*, that, so construed, the statute is an unconstitutional restraint upon interstate commerce. *Sioux Remedy Co. v. Cope*, 235 U. S. 197.

A statute of the same general nature being in force, a foreign corporation sued to collect a debt which arose from a similar sale. *Held*, that the statute does not apply to suits arising from interstate commerce. *American Art Works v. Chicago Picture Frame Works*, 264 Ill. 610, 106 N. E. 440.

The first case settles a previous conflict of authority by applying to these statutes the principle that a state may not, in exercising its right to impose conditions upon the admission of foreign corporations, thereby hamper inter-